arXiv:1511.08138v3 [math.OC] 2 Nov 2016

Uniformly hyperbolic control theory

Christoph Kawan *

Abstract

This paper gives a summary of a body of work at the intersection of control theory and smooth nonlinear dynamics. The main idea is to transfer the concept of uniform hyperbolicity, central to the theory of smooth dynamical systems, to control-affine systems. Combining the strength of geometric control theory and the hyperbolic theory of dynamical systems, it is possible to deduce control-theoretic results of non-local nature that reveal remarkable analogies to the classical hyperbolic theory of dynamical systems. This includes, in particular, results in networked control involving communication channels of finite capacity.

1 Introduction

A special feature of control-affine systems

$$\Sigma: \quad \dot{x} = f_0(x) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i(t) f_i(x), \quad x \in M,\ u \in \mathcal{U},$$

with a compact and convex control range consists in the construction of a continuous skew-product flow Φ, called the control flow of Σ, on the extended state space $\mathcal{U} \times M$, where the dynamics on the compact base space $\mathcal{U}$ is given by the shift flow $\theta_t u(s) = u(t+s)$, and the dynamics on M is given by the solutions $\varphi(t, x, u)$ to the differential equation. The topological theory of Colonius-Kliemann [7] provides an approach to understanding the global controllability structure of control systems. Two central notions of this theory are control and chain control sets. Control sets are the maximal regions of complete approximate controllability in M and they correspond to the maximal sets of topological transitivity of Φ. In contrast, chain control sets correspond to the maximal sets of chain transitivity of Φ, and they can be regarded as outer approximations of the control sets. If $E \subset M$ is a chain control set, the associated chain transitive set of Φ is given by $\mathcal{E} = \{(u, x) \in \mathcal{U} \times M : \varphi(\mathbb{R}, x, u) \subset E\}$. If E is compact,

*The author thanks Professor Lai-Sang Young for the hospitality at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences in 2014 and many inspiring mathematical conversations. Furthermore, he kindly acknowledges the support of DFG fellowship KA 3893/1-1 during this time. CK is with the Faculty of Computer Science and Mathematics, University of Passau, 94032 Passau, Germany; e-mail: christoph.kawan@uni-passau.de

$\mathcal{E}$ is a compact invariant set of Φ and in particular it can support two forms of uniform hyperbolicity, without and with center bundle. In the first case, the tangent space T_xM splits into subspaces $E^-_{u,x}$ and $E^+_{u,x}$ for each $(u,x) \in \mathcal{E}$, invariant under the differential of $\varphi(t,\cdot,u)$, such that vectors in $E^\mp_{u,x}$ are uniformly exponentially contracted in forward resp. in backward time. In the second case, additionally an invariant one-dimensional bundle $E^0_{u,x}$ is present whose elements are neither contracted in forward nor in backward time. In either case, tools from the theory of smooth dynamical systems can be applied to analyze controllability and robustness properties. Moreover, in the case without center bundle, the smallest channel capacity above which the set E can be rendered invariant by a controller that receives state information through a digital channel can be computed.

In [5], a shadowing lemma is used to prove that a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set (with or without center bundle) is the closure of a control set. As a consequence, such sets vary continuously in the Hausdorff metric in dependence on parameters of the system. Under some control-theoretic regularity assumptions, a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set without center bundle arises around hyperbolic equilibrium points of autonomous flows by adding sufficiently small control vector fields (resp., by keeping the control range small). Examples which allow for an explicit description of the tangent space decomposition can be found on the flag manifolds of a noncompact real semisimple Lie group G. The control-affine system here is induced by a right-invariant system on G. In this case, only finitely many chain control sets exist and each carries a partially hyperbolic structure (which may be degenerate in some cases). The uniformly hyperbolic ones are those for which the center bundle is zero- or one-dimensional. The paper [11] provides a complete classification of these sets, using extensively the semigroup theory developed by San Martin and coworkers [4, 23, 24, 25]. Another result about uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets without center bundle, proved in [16], reveals that under mild assumptions (including that $\mathcal{E}$ is an isolated invariant set) the lifted set $\mathcal{E}$ is the graph of a continuous map from $\mathcal{U}$ to E, i.e., $\mathcal{E} = \{(u, x(u)) : u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ and $u \mapsto x(u)$ is continuous. The main tool in the proof is a shadowing lemma for general skew-products, proved in [18].

An important quantity associated with a controlled invariant set E is its invariance entropy $h_{\mathrm{inv}}(E)$. This quantity measures the exponential complexity of the control task of keeping the system inside E. It also has an information-theoretic interpretation as the smallest bit rate in a noiseless channel which provides the controller with information about the state, such that above this rate E can be rendered invariant. In [10] it is shown that for a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set E without center bundle,

$$h_{\mathrm{inv}}(E) = \inf_{u\in\mathcal{U}} \limsup_{t\to\infty} \frac{1}{t} \log J^+ \mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u}(x(u)),$$

where $J^+\mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u}(x(u)) = |\det \mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u}(x(u))|_{E^+_{u,x(u)}}|$ is the unstable determinant. The proof of this formula involves advanced results from geometric control theory about genericity of universally regular control functions in smooth systems

[9] as well as tools from hyperbolic dynamics such as the Bowen-Ruelle volume lemma for dynamical balls [17] and a shadowing result for the shift flow on $\mathcal{U}$. The proof of the formula for $h_{\text{inv}}(E)$ in particular reveals the interesting fact that in order to make E invariant with a bit rate arbitrarily close to $h_{\text{inv}}(E)$, no control strategies more complicated than stabilization at periodic orbits are necessary. The paper [8] gives an application of this result to a problem related with a continuously stirred tank reactor. Moreover, the paper [12] shows that the invariance entropy on uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets depends continuously on system parameters.

In the following Sections 2–7, we explain these results in greater detail. In Section 8, we give a brief account of the related subjects known as 'control of chaos' and 'partial chaos', and in Section 9 we outline some problems and ideas for future research.

2 Control sets and chain control sets

A control-affine system is governed by differential equations of the form

$$\Sigma: \ \dot{x}(t) = f_0(x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i(t) f_i(x(t)), \ u \in \mathcal{U},$$

where $x(t)$ lives on a Riemannian manifold M (the state space) and $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of admissible control functions, which we assume to be of the form $\mathcal{U} = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, U)$ with $U \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ being a compact and convex set satisfying $0 \in \text{int}U$. Assuming that $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are $\mathcal{C}^1$-vector fields and that the solution $\varphi(t, x, u)$ for the initial value x at time $t = 0$ and the control u exists on $\mathbb{R}$ for all $(u, x) \in \mathcal{U} \times M$, we obtain a skew-product flow

$$\Phi_t(u, x) = (\theta_t u, \varphi(t, x, u)), \ t \in \mathbb{R},$$

that acts on $\mathcal{U} \times M$. Here $\theta_t u = u(t + \cdot)$ denotes the shift flow on $\mathcal{U}$. With the weak*-topology of $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m) = L^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^m)^*$, $\mathcal{U}$ becomes a compact metrizable space and Φ a continuous flow, called the *control flow* of Σ. We write $\varphi_{t,u} = \varphi(t, \cdot, u)$.

A *control set* of Σ is a subset $D \subset M$ such that

(i) for every $x \in D$ there is $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\varphi(\mathbb{R}_+, x, u) \subset D$,

(ii) for every $x \in D$, $D \subset \text{cl}\mathcal{O}^+(x)$ (i.e., approximate controllability holds on D), and

(iii) D is maximal with (i) and (ii) in the sense of set inclusion.

A *chain control set* $E \subset M$ is a set such that

(i) for every $x \in E$ there is $u \in \mathcal{U}$ with $\varphi(\mathbb{R}, x, u) \subset E$,

(ii) for all $x, y \in E$ and $\varepsilon, T > 0$ there are $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_0, \dots, u_{n-1} \in \mathcal{U}$, $x = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n = y$ and $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} \geq T$ such that $d(\varphi(t_i, x_i, u_i), x_{i+1}) < \varepsilon$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, and

(iii) E is maximal with (i) and (ii) in the sense of set inclusion.

The *lift* of a chain control set E is defined by

$$\mathcal{E} := \{(u, x) \in \mathcal{U} \times M \ : \ \varphi(\mathbb{R}, x, u) \subset E\}.$$

It is a maximal invariant chain transitive set of the control flow, hence a chain recurrent component if M is compact. If Σ is locally accessible and D is a control set with nonempty interior, then D is contained in a chain control set (which is unique, since different chain control sets are disjoint). In general, chain control sets are closed, while control sets are neither open nor closed except when they are invariant in backward or forward time, respectively.

A chain control set E is *uniformly hyperbolic without center bundle (u.h.)* if it is compact and for every $(u, x) \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists a splitting

$$T_x M = E^-_{u,x} \oplus E^+_{u,x}$$

into linear subspaces such that

(i) $\mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u} E^\pm_{u,x} = E^\pm_{\Phi_t(u,x)}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(u, x) \in \mathcal{E}$, and

(ii) there are constants $c, \lambda > 0$ such that

$$|\mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u}(x)v| \leq c^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda t}|v| \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,\ v \in E^-_{u,x}$$

and

$$|\mathrm{d}\varphi_{t,u}(x)v| \geq c\mathrm{e}^{\lambda t}|v| \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0,\ v \in E^+_{u,x}.$$

This definition is independent of the Riemannian metric, however, the constant c depends on the choice of the metric. From the two conditions it automatically follows that the subspaces $E^\pm_{u,x}$ change continuously with (u, x), cf. [15, Ch. 6].

If the tangent spaces $T_x M$, $(u, x) \in \mathcal{E}$, admit continuous invariant splittings

$$T_x M = E^-_{u,x} \oplus E^0_{u,x} \oplus E^+_{u,x},$$

with uniform exponential contraction on $E^-_{u,x}$ and expansion on $E^+_{u,x}$ (as above), and $E^0_{u,x}$ is one-dimensional and corresponds to the flow direction for constant controls, we say that E is *uniformly hyperbolic with center bundle (u.h.c.)*.

3 A structural result

For uncontrolled time-invariant systems in continuous time, the notion of uniform hyperbolicity without center bundle has not much meaning, because any trajectory that is bounded and bounded away from equilibria has a zero Lyapunov exponent, namely the exponent in the flow direction. As a consequence,

every uniformly hyperbolic invariant set without center bundle is a discrete set of equilibrium points (a precise proof for this well-known fact is given in [16, Prop. 4]). However, for control-affine systems the situation is different, since u.h. chain control sets with nonempty interior exist. However, their structure can be shown to be relatively simple; under mild assumptions, their lifts are graphs over $\mathcal{U}$. More precisely, the following theorem holds, cf. [16, Thm. 5].

Theorem 1 *Let E be a u.h. chain control set. Assume that $\mathcal{E}$ is an isolated invariant set of Φ and let u_0 be a constant control function with value in* int$U$. *Additionally suppose that the following hypotheses are satisfied:*

(i) The vector fields $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty$ and the Lie algebra generated by them has full rank at each point of E.

(ii) For each x with $(u_0, x) \in \mathcal{E}$ and each $\rho \in (0, 1]$ it holds that $x \in \text{int}\mathcal{O}^+_\rho(x)$, where $\mathcal{O}^+_\rho(x) = \{\varphi(t, x, u) : t \geq 0,\ u \in \mathcal{U}^\rho\}$ with

$$\mathcal{U}^\rho = \{u \in \mathcal{U} \ : \ u(t) \in u_0 + \rho(U - u_0) \ \text{a.e.}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{E}$ is the graph of a continuous function $\mathcal{U} \to E$.

For condition (ii) note that each $x \in E$ kept in E by a constant control function is necessarily an equilibrium point. Since hyperbolic equilibria are isolated, condition (ii) has to be checked only for finitely many points x. A sufficient condition, independent of ρ, for (ii) to hold is the controllability of the linearization at (u_0, x).

The above theorem can be seen as a technical lemma, which is very useful for proving more advanced results such as Theorem 3 in Section 6, characterizing the smallest bit rate in a digital channel above which E can be rendered invariant. Theorem 1 implies that the restriction of the control flow Φ to $\mathcal{E}$ is topologically conjugate to the shift flow on $\mathcal{U}$ via the continuous projection map $\pi_1 : (u, x) \mapsto u$, i.e., π_1 is a homeomorphism and the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E} & \xrightarrow{\Phi_t} & \mathcal{E} \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_1}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_1} \\ \mathcal{U} & \xrightarrow[\theta_t]{} & \mathcal{U} \end{array}$$

Indeed, the characterization of $\mathcal{E}$ as a graph $\{(u, x(u)) : u \in \mathcal{U}\}$ implies that $\pi_1 : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{U}$ is invertible with $\pi_1^{-1}(u) = (u, x(u))$. Since both $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are compact metric spaces, π_1 is a homeomorphism. Moreover, $\pi_1(\Phi_t(u, x(u))) = \theta_t u = \theta_t \pi_1(u, x(u))$, showing that π_1 is a conjugacy. Hence, all topological properties of the shift flow carry over to $\Phi|_{\mathcal{E}}$.

4 Algebraic examples

Examples of u.h. chain control sets can be constructed as follows. We start with a bilinear control system on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$:

$$\dot{x}(t) = \Big(A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i(t)A_i\Big)x(t),\ u \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{1}$$

Since $\varphi_{t,u}$ is a linear isomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for all t and u, the system induces another control-affine system on the n-dimensional projective space $\mathbb{P}^n = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{R}^{n+1})$, the space of all lines through 0 in $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. A description of the chain control sets of this system comes out of Selgrade's theorem about linear flows on vector bundles with chain transitive base (cf. [7, Ch. 5]). In our case, the vector bundle is $\mathcal{U}\times\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and the linear flow is the control flow of (1). By chain transitivity of θ, Selgrade's result can be applied and it yields a description of the chain recurrent components of the control flow on $\mathcal{U}\times\mathbb{P}^n$, whose projections to M are the chain control sets. More precisely, there exists a Whitney sum decomposition

$$\mathcal{U}\times\mathbb{R}^{n+1} = \mathcal{W}^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{W}^r,$$

where $r \leq n+1$, into invariant subbundles $\mathcal{W}^i$ and the chain recurrent components $\mathcal{E}_i$ correspond to these $\mathcal{W}^i$ in the sense that

$$\mathcal{E}_i = \left\{(u,\mathbb{P}x) \in \mathcal{U}\times\mathbb{P}^n : (u,x) \in \mathcal{W}^i\right\},\ 1 \leq i \leq r.$$

We fix $i \in \{1,\ldots,r\}$ and order $\mathcal{W}^1,\ldots,\mathcal{W}^r$ by increasing growth rates. Then we define

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{W}^- := \mathcal{W}^1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{W}^{i-1},\ \mathcal{W}^+ := \mathcal{W}^{i+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{W}^r,\\ &\mathcal{W}^0 := \mathcal{W}^i.\end{aligned}$$

Projecting to $\mathbb{P}^n$ by $E^{\pm}_{u,\mathbb{P}x} := \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x)\mathcal{W}^{\pm}(u)$ and $E^0_{u,\mathbb{P}x} := \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}(x)\mathcal{W}^0(u)$ (here $\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{R}^{n+1}\backslash\{0\} \to \mathbb{P}^n$ denotes the projection map which sends x to its equivalence class, i.e., the line through x), we obtain a splitting

$$T_{\mathbb{P}x}\mathbb{P}^n = E^-_{u,\mathbb{P}x} \oplus E^0_{u,\mathbb{P}x} \oplus E^+_{u,\mathbb{P}x}. \tag{2}$$

From the fact that $\mathcal{W}^+$, $\mathcal{W}^0$ and $\mathcal{W}^-$ are exponentially separated one can deduce that the splitting $E^- \oplus E^+$ is uniformly hyperbolic. Hence, if E^0 is trivial, i.e., 0-dimensional, the chain control set $E_i = \{\mathbb{P}x \in \mathbb{P}^n : (u,x) \in \mathcal{E}_i\}$ turns out to be u.h.

Chain control sets on $\mathbb{P}^n$ of this type can also be seen as control-dependent 'eigenvectors'. Indeed, if A_0 has a real eigenvalue of multiplicity one and $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ is an associated eigenvector, then $\mathbb{P}x_0$ is an isolated hyperbolic equilibrium of the induced flow on $\mathbb{P}^n$. By adding small control terms u_iA_i, this equilibrium can blow up to a u.h. chain control set E with nonempty interior and each point in E is of the form $z(u)$ for an equivariant continuous map $z : \mathcal{U} \to E$, where $z(0) = \mathbb{P}x_0$.

A bilinear system not only induces a system on projective space, but also on Grassmannians and flag manifolds. Another way to describe these systems is by looking at a right-invariant system on the Lie group $G = \mathrm{GL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$ or $G = \mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$ (if $\mathrm{tr} A_i = 0$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, m$) given by

$$\dot{g}(t) = \Big(A_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i(t) A_i\Big) g(t), \quad u \in \mathcal{U},$$

where $g(t) \in G$, and viewing the flag manifolds as homogeneous spaces of this group. This can be generalized by replacing the group $\mathrm{SL}(n+1, \mathbb{R})$ with an arbitrary non-compact semisimple Lie group G and the bilinear system with a right-invariant system on G. Then one can study the induced systems on the generalized flag manifolds $\mathbb{F}_\Theta = G/P_\Theta$, where P_Θ denotes a parabolic subgroup of G characterized by a set Θ of simple roots. With tools from semisimple Lie theory and semigroup theory one can show that the chain control sets of such systems also have a partially hyperbolic structure as in (2). In [11] the u.h. chain control sets are characterized via the so-called flag type of the control flow. We do not go into further details here, because this would necessitate to introduce plenty of Lie-theoretic notions.

We note that also in the classical uniformly hyperbolic theory the simplest examples are given by algebraic systems, namely by linear automorphisms of the n-dimensional torus, which are Anosov diffeomorphisms, i.e., diffeomorphisms that admit a hyperbolic structure on the whole state space, cf. [13].

5 Controllability and robustness

A very useful property of uniformly hyperbolic systems is the shadowing property. Roughly speaking, shadowing means that ε-close to any δ-approximate orbit (as used in the definition of chain control sets) there exists a unique real orbit, where $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon)$. Using this property, it is possible to show that a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set E (with or without center bundle) is the closure of a control set, provided that it a has nonempty interior and local accessibility holds. In general, this does not hold. In fact, a chain control set may contain several control sets that have positive distance to each other.

This result has the remarkable consequence that compact uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets change continuously in the Hausdorff metric with respect to parameters of the systems. Such a parameter, e.g., could be the size of the control range or any vector parameter which continuously influences the vector fields $f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_m$. More precisely, the following result holds, cf. [5, Thm. 2 and Thm. 3].

Theorem 2 *Consider a parametrized control-affine system of the form*

$$\dot{x}(t) = f_0(\alpha, x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^{m} u_i(t) f_i(\alpha, x(t)), \quad u \in \mathcal{U},$$

where the parametrized vector fields $f_i : A \times M \to TM$ with $A \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and M a smooth manifold are of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty$. Assume that for a fixed parameter $\alpha_0 \in \operatorname{int} A$ the Lie algebra rank condition holds on a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set E^{α_0}. Then E^{α_0} is the closure of a control set and for each α in a neighborhood of α_0 there is a unique control set D^α such that $\alpha \mapsto \operatorname{cl} D^\alpha$ is continuous in the Hausdorff metric at α_0 with $\operatorname{int} D^\alpha \cap \operatorname{int} D^{\alpha_0} \neq \emptyset$.

Note that this theorem in particular implies that a control-affine system is completely controllable on the interior of a uniformly hyperbolic chain control set E provided that the Lie algebra rank condition is satisfied on E. This follows by combining the approximate controllability on the control set and the local accessibility guaranteed by the Lie algebra rank condition. Since chain control sets are easier to determine than control sets (numerically and analytically), this result is important for the understanding of the controllability properties of a system.

Theorem 2 corresponds to well-known robustness results in the uniformly hyperbolic theory of smooth dynamical systems (e.g., structural stability of Axiom A systems). The controllability part of the result is analogous to topological transitivity on Axiom A basic sets, cf. [13, Sec. 3.3(a)].

6 Invariance entropy

The invariance entropy is a non-negative quantity that can be assigned to any compact controlled invariant set Q and measures the exponential complexity of the control task of keeping the system inside Q, cf. [6, 15]. For continuous-time systems, it is defined as follows. Let K be a compact subset of Q. For $\tau > 0$, a set $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{U}$ of controls is called (τ, K, Q)-spanning if for each $x \in K$ there is $u \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\varphi([0,\tau], x, u) \subset Q$. The minimal cardinality of such a set is denoted by $r_{\text{inv}}(\tau, K, Q)$ and

$$h_{\text{inv}}(K, Q) := \limsup_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \log r_{\text{inv}}(\tau, K, Q)$$

is called the *invariance entropy* of the pair (K, Q). Invariance entropy is essentially equivalent to the notion of *topological feedback entropy*, introduced in [19].



Figure 1: Control over a digital channel

Invariance entropy has the following information-theoretic interpretation: Suppose that a sensor measures the states of the system at discrete sampling times $\tau_k = k\tau$ for some $\tau > 0$. A coder receiving these measurements generates at each sampling time τ_k a symbol s_k from a finite coding alphabet S_k of time-varying size. This symbol is transmitted through a digital noiseless channel to a controller, see Fig. 1. The controller, upon receiving s_k, generates an open-loop control u_k on $[0, \tau]$ used as the control input in the time interval $[\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}]$. The aim of this coding and control device is to keep trajectories in Q, when $x_0 \in K$. The invariance entropy $h_{\mathrm{inv}}(K, Q)$ is the smallest channel bit rate above which a coder and a controller can be designed so that this control objective is achieved.

For u.h. chain control sets we have the following result, cf. [10, Thm. 5.4].

Theorem 3 *Assume that E is a u.h. chain control set of Σ with nonempty interior satisfying the conditions of Theorem 1. Then E is the closure of a control set D and for every compact $K \subset D$ with positive volume it holds that*

$$h_{\mathrm{inv}}(K, E) = \inf_{(u,x)\in\mathcal{E}} \limsup_{\tau\to\infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \log J_x^+ \mathrm{d}\varphi_{\tau,u}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$J_x^+ \mathrm{d}\varphi_{\tau,u} = \left| \det \left(\mathrm{d}\varphi_{\tau,u}(x)|_{E^+_{u,x}} : E^+_{u,x} \to E^+_{\Phi_\tau(u,x)} \right) \right|.$$

Moreover, the infimum in (3) can be taken only over the Φ-periodic points $(u, x) \in \mathcal{E}$. For a periodic point (u, x) the lim sup in (3) is equal to the sum of the positive Lyapunov exponents along the corresponding periodic trajectory. This sum in turn is the exponential complexity of the control task of stabilizing the system (locally and exponentially) around the periodic trajectory.

Again, we have a remarkable analogy to the theory of smooth dynamical systems, where the notions of measure-theoretic and topological entropy play a crucial role, and can be shown to depend only on the periodic orbits in the case of uniform hyperbolicity, cf. [2, 3].

Additionally to the robustness result of Theorem 2, concerning the dependence of u.h. chain control sets on parameters, a robustness result for the associated invariance entropy can be proved, which reads as follows, cf. [12].

Theorem 4 *Consider a parametrized control-affine system of the form*

$$\Sigma^\alpha : \ \dot{x}(t) = f_0(\alpha, x(t)) + \sum_{i=1}^m u_i(t) f_i(\alpha, x(t)), \quad u \in \mathcal{U},$$

where the parametrized vector fields $f_i : A \times M \to TM$ with $A \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ and M a smooth manifold are of class $\mathcal{C}^\infty$. Assume that for a fixed parameter $\alpha_0 \in \mathrm{int} A$ a u.h. chain control set E^{α^0} exists, which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. Furthermore, assume that for all α in a neighborhood of α^0, the system Σ^α satisfies the Lie algebra rank condition on a neighborhood of E^{α^0}. Then for each α in a (possibly smaller) neighborhood of α^0, the system Σ^α has a u.h. chain control set E^α and the map $\alpha \mapsto h_{\mathrm{inv}}(K, E^\alpha)$ is continuous on this neighborhood.

7 Application to a stirred tank reactor

In this section, we provide an example which comes from a concrete application. The equation

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}_1 \\ \dot{x}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -x_1 - a(x_1 - x_c) + B\alpha(1 - x_2)\mathrm{e}^{x_1} \\ -x_2 + \alpha(1 - x_2)\mathrm{e}^{x_1} \end{pmatrix} + u(t) \begin{pmatrix} x_c - x_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

models a continuous stirred tank reactor with Arrhenius' dynamics, cf., e.g. [21].



Figure 2: Phase portrait of the continuous flow stirred tank reactor and control sets

Here x_1 is the (dimensionless) temperature; x_2 is the product concentration; and a, α, B, x_c are positive constants. The parameter x_c is the coolant temperature, and hence the control affects the heat transfer coefficient. In the following, we look at the system for the parameters

$$a = 0.15,\ \alpha = 0.05,\ B = 7.0,\ x_c = 1.0,$$
$$U_\rho = [\rho, \rho] \text{ with } 0 < \rho \leq 0.15.$$

Because of the physical constraints, we consider the system in the set $[0, \infty) \times [0, 1] \subset \mathbb{R}^2$. For each fixed $u \in U_\rho$ (i.e., for each constant control function), we have three equilibria, given by

$$p_i = (z_i, y_i), \quad y_i = \frac{\alpha \mathrm{e}^{z_i}}{1 + \alpha z_i}$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2$, where $z_1 < z_0 < z_2$ are the solutions of the transcendental equation

$$-z - (a + u)(z - x_c) + B\alpha \frac{\mathrm{e}^z}{1 + \alpha \mathrm{e}^z} = 0.$$

The equilibria p_1 and p_2 are stable, while p_0 is hyperbolic, i.e., the linearization at p_0 has one positive and one negative eigenvalue. The phase portrait of the uncontrolled equation is depicted in Fig. 2.

The system satisfies the Lie algebra rank condition at every point of the forward-invariant set $(0,\infty)\times(0,1)$ (see [7, Sec. 9.1] for a verification of this fact). Numerical computations suggest that the rectangle $[0,7]\times[0,1]$ contains exactly three control sets C_1^ρ, C_2^ρ and D^ρ, containing the equilibria $p_1(u), p_2(u)$ and $p_0(u)$ for $u \in \mathrm{int}U^\rho = (-\rho,\rho)$ in their interiors (this follows from an application of [7, Cor. 4.1.12]). The control sets C_1^ρ and C_2^ρ are invariant, while D^ρ is variant (i.e., escape from D^ρ is possible). Figure 2 shows the situation for $\rho = 0.15$.

An interesting property of this system is that the stable equilibrium p_2 with the highest product concentration cannot be realized for technical reasons (see [1]). Hence, it is of interest to keep the system near the hyperbolic equilibrium point p_0. For ρ small enough, the control set D^ρ is uniformly hyperbolic, which follows from standard results on the persistence of hyperbolicity under small perturbations (see, e.g., [17]). From [7, Cor. 3.4.10] it follows that the chain control sets of the system shrink to the equilibrium points p_i as the control range shrinks to $\{0\}$. Hence, for ρ small enough, the chain control set E_0^ρ (containing p_0) is uniformly hyperbolic and thus satisfies $E_0^\rho = \mathrm{cl}D^\rho$. We can therefore apply all the results of the preceding sections, which in particular tell us the following about the system under consideration:

(1) The control set D^ρ varies continuously in the Hausdorff metric when the parameters $(\rho, a, \alpha, B, x_c)$ are varied.

(2) The critical bit rate necessary for rendering D^ρ invariant varies continuously with the parameters.

(3) Rendering D^ρ invariant with a bit rate arbitrarily close to the theoretical infimum is possible by stabilization of a periodic orbit in $\mathrm{int}D^\rho$. The corresponding bit rate for this control strategy is given by the sum of the unstable eigenvalues of the monodromy operator associated with the periodic orbit (divided by the period).

8 Control and partial control of chaos

This survey on uniformly hyperbolic control theory would not be complete without some remarks about the subjects known by the names 'control of chaos' and 'partial control (of chaos)', which also use ideas from the hyperbolic theory of dynamical systems. The idea of the first is to produce desired controlled trajectories with low energy use by fixing an unstable periodic orbit inside a chaotic (possibly hyperbolic) attractor of an uncontrolled dynamical system and stabilizing this orbit via very small time-dependent perturbations of a system parameter, applied once in a while. This method (which essentially exists in two variants, called the *OGY method* [20] and the *Pyragas method* [22]) has proven to be extremely useful and effective. Its main advantage is that it does not

require a detailed model of the chaotic attractor, but only some information about a Poincaré section, which is used to determine the periodic orbit. Since a typical trajectory in a neighborhood of the chaotic attractor will come close to any periodic orbit, one can just wait until the system runs into a small enough neighborhood of the fixed trajectory and then apply the control algorithm. Experimental applications of control of chaos include turbulent fluids, oscillating chemical reactions, magneto-mechanical oscillators, and cardiac tissues.

While the idea of controlling chaos was first introduced in the 1990 paper [20], the idea of 'partial control' is relatively new, cf. [26]. Here one fixes a non-attracting hyperbolic invariant set of an uncontrolled equation and adds both noise and control terms to the equation. Using horseshoe structures, it is possible to show the existence of a non-trivial 'safe region' around the hyperbolic set which is controlled invariant in the sense that whenever the initial condition lies in this region, no matter what the disturbance is, one can always choose a control that keeps the system in the safe region for the next time step. The safe region, in general, has a complicated geometric structure, although it is not a fractal set. The main novelty in this approach is that the absolute value of the control can be chosen strictly smaller than the maximal possible disturbance. The name 'partial control' comes from the fact that the method does not allow to follow any particular trajectory, but only guarantees that the system stays close to the chaotic set.

While the theory described in Sections 2–6 is rather concerned with the general analysis of control systems, the ideas described in this section aim at concrete control algorithms to be practically implemented, even without knowing the exact equations governing the system.

9 Future directions

The results described in this paper mainly deal with continuous-time systems and the simpler type of uniform hyperbolicity without center bundle. It is desirable to extend the results to the discrete-time case and uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets with center bundle. Particular difficulties will arise in extending the result about invariance entropy, because its proof is heavily based on the structural result of Theorem 1, which does no longer hold in the case with center bundle. Furthermore, the proof of Theorem 3 requires an elaborate result of Coron [9] on the genericity of universally regular control functions in smooth systems, an analogue of which does not seem to be available in the discrete-time case.

Another possible future direction concerns the extension of the controllability and robustness result described in Section 5 to the partially hyperbolic case, when a center bundle of dimension ≥ 2 is present. Examples for this behavior can be derived from the construction described in Section 4, or the more general Lie-theoretic construction in [11]. In the uncontrolled case, the theory of partial hyperbolicity (see [14]) is quite well-developed so that one can hope to transfer methods of this theory to the control-affine case and obtain some results about

the controllability structure inside a partially hyperbolic chain control set.

References

[1] R. Bellman, J. Bentsman, S. M. Meerkov. Vibrational control of systems with Arrhenius dynamics. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 91 (1983), no. 1, 152–191.

[2] R. Bowen. Topological entropy and Axiom A. Global Analysis, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 14 (1970), 23–41.

[3] R. Bowen. Periodic orbits for hyperbolic flows. Amer. J. Math. 94 (1972), 1–30.

[4] C. J. Braga Barros and L. A. B. San Martin. Chain transitive sets for flows on flag bundles. Forum Math. 19 (2007), 1, 19–60.

[5] F. Colonius and W. Du. Hyperbolic control sets and chain control sets. J. Dynam. Control Systems 7 (2001), no. 1, 49–59.

[6] F. Colonius and C. Kawan. Invariance entropy for control systems. SIAM J. Control Optim. 48, no. 3 (2009), 1701–1721.

[7] F. Colonius and W. Kliemann. The Dynamics of Control. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2000.

[8] F. Colonius and R. Lettau. Relative controllability properties. IMA Journal of Mathematical Control and Information 2015, doi:10.1093/imamci/dnv004

[9] J.–M. Coron, Linearized control systems and applications to smooth stabilization. SIAM J. Control Optim. 32 (1994), no. 2, 358–386.

[10] A. Da Silva and C. Kawan. Invariance entropy of hyperbolic control sets. Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 36 (2016), no. 1, 97–136.

[11] A. Da Silva and C. Kawan. Hyperbolic chain control sets on flag manifolds. J. Dyn. Control Syst. 21, no. 4 (2015), 1–21.

[12] A. Da Silva and C. Kawan. Robustness of critical bit rates for practical stabilization of networked control systems. Submitted, 2016. Preprint: arXiv:1610.07551 [math.OC]

[13] B. Hasselblatt. Hyperbolic dynamical systems. Handbook of dynamical systems, Vol. 1A, 239–319, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2002.

[14] B. Hasselblatt, B., Y. Pesin. Partially hyperbolic dynamical systems. Handbook of dynamical systems. Vol. 1B, 1–55, Elsevier, 2006

[15] C. Kawan. Invariance Entropy for Deterministic Control Systems. An Introduction. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2089. Springer, 2013.

[16] C. Kawan. On the structure of uniformly hyperbolic chain control sets. Systems Control Lett. 90 (2016), 71–75.

[17] P.–D. Liu. Random perturbations of Axiom A basic sets. J. Statist. Phys. 90 (1998), no. 1-2, 467–490.

[18] K. R. Meyer and X. Zhang. Stability of skew dynamical systems. J. Differential Equations 132 (1996), no. 1, 66–86.

[19] G. N. Nair, R. J. Evans, I. M. Y. Mareels, and W. Moran. Topological feedback entropy and nonlinear stabilization. IEEE Trans. Automat. Control 49 (2004), no. 9, 1585–1597.

[20] E. Ott, C. Grebogi, J. A. Yorke. Controlling chaos. Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990), no. 11, 1196–1199.

[21] A. B. Poore. A model equation arising from chemical reactor theory. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 52 (1973), 358–388.

[22] K. Pyragas. Continuous control of chaos by self-controlling feedback. Physics letters A 170.6 (1992): 421–428.

[23] L. A. B. San Martin. Order and domains of attraction of control sets in flag manifolds. J. Lie Theory 8 (1998), 2, 335–350.

[24] L. A. B. San Martin and L. Seco. Morse and Lyapunov spectra and dynamics on flag bundles. Ergod. Th. & Dynam. Sys. 30 (2010), 3, 893–922.

[25] L. A. B. San Martin and P. A. Tonelli. Semigroup actions on homogeneous spaces. Semigroup Forum 50 (1995), 1, 59–88.

[26] S. Zambrano, M. A. F. Sanjuàn, J. A. Yorke. Partial control of chaotic systems. Phys. Rev. E (3) 77 (2008), no. 5, 055201.